Statewide Voter File Subgroup
Vote Indiana Team
April 4, 2003

Members present: Linda Grass, Laura Herzog, Brad King, Zach Main, Regina Moore, Robin Winston, Pat Padowski (proxy for Sally LaSota) and Todd Rokita. Facilitators: Sarah Taylor and Holly Davis.

Others present: Sherry Beck (Marion County Board of Voter Registration Office), Julie Booth (Accenture), Chris Horne and Cheryl Kennard (Quest Information Systems), Jeff Moore (Convansys), Tom Gallagher (Indiana Protection and Advocacy Service Commission), Michael Davis (Indiana Chamber of Commerce), Julia Vaughn, Mike and Edelle Rothrock (Count Us In), and Stephanie Miller (Common Cause).

Sarah Taylor and Brad King gave updates on agenda items from the previous meeting. Mr. King reported he was beginning to get some responses from the states with statewide voter files and he looked forward to sharing the results with the subgroup members. Mrs. Taylor commented on the Secretary of State's meeting with representatives from the Bureau of Motor Vehicles. They are interested in exploring the role of electronic signatures in the voter registration process and plan to attend future subgroup meetings. The Departments of Health and Correction have also been contacted about the Vote Indiana Team and their role in implementing the Help America Vote Act (HAVA). Currently, both agencies send information quarterly in paper form.

Zach Main presented his idea for a unique identifier, suggesting that, for those people for whom driver's license numbers had not been collected, the date of birth be used followed by the last four digits in the person's social security number, such that MMDDYYY-XXXX. Subgroup members agreed that if a person's last four digits of the social security number are unknown, the date of birth would be followed by XXXX to alert poll workers and election administrators that those numbers needed to be captured. The Election Administration subgroup was discussing ways to handle the "flagging" of voters with incomplete unique identifying numbers. **Consensus was reached on using the birth date followed by the last four digits of the social security number for the unique identifier when a driver's license number is not available.**

Mr. King reviewed the many agencies with full and passive voter registration responsibilities and that HAVA called for coordination between those agencies and the statewide voter file. Mr. Main suggested that as information electronically flows from one agency to another, it be checked against the statewide voter file, flagging any changes in names, addresses, and death records. County voter registration officials would then have the ability to look at flagged records and double check the information before making any decision on processing. Subgroup members thought this would be a good way to "check and balance" the process. **Consensus was reached that the system have the ability for the county official to provide text information if they do not remove a flagged voter and that the state would be able to receive reports on flagged voters.** Robin Winston suggested that the Bureau of Motor Vehicles and the Department

of Revenue would be good sources for checking information against the statewide voter file. Cheryl Kennard with Quest Information Systems informed the subgroup that from a technological standpoint, what they were discussing was possible. Sherry Beck of the Marion County Board of Voter Registration offered a comment of clarification.

Mr. King told the members that Minnesota and Michigan would both welcome a visit from the subgroup to demonstrate how their statewide voter file systems work. Mr. Winston added that although Kentucky's system has some advantages that other states do not have, their system might be worth looking at as well. It was determined that in each of the states, access to view both the statewide and local systems would be available.

Mr. King went over the current laws in Indiana on confidentiality and fee requirements regarding the voter file and informed the group that there was current legislation pending that would maintain the status quo. He went on to say that it appear that HAVA envisioned counties having the ability to see other counties' information, but only having the ability to change their own county's information, in essence a "read only, non downloadable" file. Members agreed there could be some advantages to that, but they liked the idea of an audit history function associated with the databases' hardware. Members also wanted to talk about the advantages of having a web based application for the voter file. Members agreed to continue their discussion on this topic and fee structure at the next meeting.

Secretary Rokita suggested the Vote Indiana Team assemble a technology group to advise on the design and be available to help guide the implementation of the file. He also asked the group to begin thinking about how provisional ballot tracking and statistics will fit into the plan for the file. He said the Election Administration subgroup had been discussing whether the onus for checking provisional status should be on the county or the voter.

Julia Vaughn of Count Us In added that linking agencies to the voter file would be beneficial to both voters and election administrators.